

OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Scheme:	BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 2) ORDER 2021 Westbrook Gardens – Removal of parking restrictions		
Date Advertised:	4.08.2021	No. of objections / comments received:	1

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify / Proceed as advertised.
X X X XXXXXXXXXX	<p>X X X XXXXXXXXXX are Westbrook Gardens residents and have the following comments to make on the proposals.</p> <p>They state that the road has benefitted from the introduction of the parking restrictions in 2015. The restrictions have meant that they do not have cars that are left in the road for the entire day. Some residents also suffered from non-residents parking with no thought given for locals wishing to leave or return to their property. In the early days enforcement of the restrictions was effective. However, recently with the town centre becoming busier and an apparent relaxation in the enforcement of the restrictions parking on the road has increased with some people ignoring the current restrictions.</p> <p>They believe the original intention of the unrestricted area was to support those living on the south of the green with shorter driveways and this has been beneficial to those houses.</p> <p>They state that the average number of cars per household is 1.6 with a very small number of cars having more than 2 cars. We believe that with the driveways and unrestricted areas there is currently sufficient parking available, and no further changes are needed.</p> <p>They add that the green area is used as a roundabout by most residents and moving around the eastern end is already difficult at present. With more parking there it will be impossible for large vehicles to turn around in the road adding further danger for residents at that end of the road.</p> <p>They conclude that the proposals are unnecessary and not advantageous to the general population of Westbrook Gardens, with the exception of a tiny minority who have a much larger number of vehicles. The proposals will result in inconvenience and possibly a danger.</p>	<p>The relaxation in the restrictions has been requested by residents who are forced to park a vehicle on the road due to not having enough off-road parking available. The current restrictions require that no cars are parked on the road between 10am – 11am Mon – Sat or they may be liable to receive a parking enforcement notice.</p> <p>The two areas where it is proposed to remove the current restrictions have been chosen as cars are regularly parked in these locations outside of the current restricted parking hours of operation.</p> <p>Under the current parking restrictions vehicles are able to park in Westbrook Gardens for most of the day, and as noted above, vehicles have been observed regularly parked in the two areas where it is proposed to remove the restrictions. The Council is not aware of any issues regarding obstructive parking being reported in Westbrook Gardens previously.</p> <p>As with the existing unrestricted areas, the two new lengths are at the end of road so are less likely to attract opportune parking.</p> <p>The comments regarding an increase in vehicles parking during the restricted period will be passed to the Council's Parking Enforcement Team for information and action.</p>	Proceed as advertised

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr R Angell - No problems from me, carry on.

Cllr I Kirke - This is an easy one – proceed!

OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Scheme:	BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 2) ORDER 2021 Wokingham Road – Prohibition of waiting restrictions		
Date Advertised:	4.08.2021	No. of objections / comments received:	8

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify / Proceed as advertised.
X X XXXXXXXX Warren Down	X XXXXXXXX is a resident of Warren Down and is glad the restrictions are being proposed as the cars make exiting the road very difficult & dangerous. X XXXXXXXX has one concern is that when the restrictions are installed that the cars will be displaced further into Warren Down where parking should be residents only. X XXXXXXXX asks if 'residents only' parking signs can be installed in Warren Down.	The residents comments regarding the dangerous parking and support for the proposals are noted. Warren Down is a private road over which the Council has no authority. As a result we are unable to provide additional signage within the road as requested.	Modify proposals as shown on Drg 5287/002A
X X XXXXX X Broadlands Court	X XXXXX is a long term resident of Broadlands Court and agrees that due to the large increase in vehicles there occasions when there is an issue with cars parking badly at the junction with Wokingham Road. X agrees that this needs to be addressed. How X feels the restrictions that are proposed are somewhat extreme and totally impractical to the residents of Broadlands Court. X adds that most of the residents have a garage and whilst some can get their car in the garages do not accommodate larger modern cars. X suggests that the scale of the proposed restrictions could be scaled down to make the junction safe but also to give residents the chance to park a sensible distance from their home.	Whilst the Council appreciates the difficult parking situation in Broadlands Court, it has received a number of complaints with regards to the obstructive parking at the junction with Wokingham Road, which have been evidenced by a number of Officer site visits and observations. The extent of the parking restrictions represents the minimum lengths to ensure adequate visibility when leaving Broadlands Court and Warren Down, ensuring that parking is not moved to the Wokingham Road exit of the nearby Round Hill roundabout and that there is adequate room for cars to safely enter Broadlands Court. However in view of the comments received we have reviewed the proposals and have amended them so to shorten the length they extend into Broadlands Court so allowing a small number of cars to continue to park in this location.	Modify proposals as shown on Drg 5287/002A
X X XXXXXXXX Broadlands Court	X XXXXXXXX agrees that something needs to be done about the parking on the road as it is dangerous pulling in and out of Broadlands Court due to how some of the cars park, and the visibility can be extremely poor. However, X does not agree to the extents of the proposal as there is not adequate parking availability to the residents.	Whilst the Council appreciates the difficult parking situation in Broadlands Court, it has received a number of complaints with regards to the obstructive parking at the junction with Wokingham Road, which have been evidenced by a number of Officer site visits and observations. The extent of the parking restrictions represents the	Modify proposals as shown on Drg 5287/002A

	<p>X adds that as the flats were built in the 60s when a lot less cars were on the road there is a very limited number of spaces and as moderns cars are bigger than in the past the garages are not capable of being used. X states that there are 45 properties in Broadlands Court and around 90 cars that need somewhere to park.</p> <p>The residents are also not able to do any changes to the parking layout as the roads and footways were taken over by the Council a number of years ago. The Council have not been maintaining the pathways, some slabs have been broken for years and are trip hazards.</p> <p>X asks that reducing the extents of the no waiting zone is considered to give the residents a chance to park near to their property. The footway that is mainly blocked has little use anyway as it leads to nowhere and there is no drop kerb to allow crossing. X states the nearest car park is ½ mile walk away and as X XXXXXXX XX X XXX XXXXXX XX XXX XXX X does not relish having to walk ½ mile to reach X car.</p> <p>X concludes by adding that if the restrictions go ahead as planned then the issue will just be moved elsewhere.</p>	<p>minimum lengths to ensure adequate visibility when leaving Broadlands Court and Warren Down, ensuring that parking is not moved to the Wokingham Road exit of the nearby Round Hill roundabout and that there is adequate room for cars to safely enter Broadlands Court. However in view of the comments received we have reviewed the proposals and have amended them so to shorten the length they extend into Broadlands Court so allowing a small number of cars to continue to park in this location.</p> <p>The shared footway/cycleway running alongside Wokingham Road links Binfield, Amen Corner, Temple Park, and the new Blue Mountain development to Bracknell town centre and other footway/cycle links.</p> <p>The length of the restrictions to the west of Broadlands Court is approximately 60 metres which represents the minimum clear visibility distance that drivers should have when entering a road with a 40mph speed limit. Cars will be able to continue parking on Wokingham Road from this point westwards.</p>	
<p>X X XXXXXXXX Broadlands Court</p>	<p>X XXXXXXXX explains that Broadlands Court was built over 50 years ago with only 15 parking spaces but today every household has one or two cars so it's not enough. X believes the Council should build more parking spaces for the residents but they have taken the easy answer and propose double yellow lines.</p> <p>X adds that Broadlands Court has a garage block but they are too narrow to park modern cars in.</p> <p>X XXXXXXXX asks the Council to look again at the problem and not go for the cheap and easy option of placing double yellow lines.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council appreciates the difficult parking situation in Broadlands Court, it has received a number of complaints with regards to the obstructive parking at the junction with Wokingham Road, which have been evidenced by a number of Officer site visits and observations. The extent of the parking restrictions represents the minimum lengths to ensure adequate visibility when leaving Broadlands Court and Warren Down, ensuring that parking is not moved to the Wokingham Road exit of the nearby Round Hill roundabout and that there is adequate room for cars to safely enter Broadlands Court. However in view of the comments received we have reviewed the proposals and have amended them so to shorten the length they extend into Broadlands Court so allowing a small number of cars to continue to park in this location.</p> <p>The Council has looked at providing additional parking areas in Broadlands Court previously but due to planning constraints and land ownership issues this was not able to be pursued further.</p>	<p>Modify proposals as shown on Drg 5287/002A</p>
<p>XXXXXXXX XXXX Broadlands Court</p>	<p>The resident would like to suggest some amendments to the proposal.</p> <p>They state that parking in Broadlands Court is a problem as there is not enough parking spaces. Not every flat has a parking space as the flats were built in 1962.</p> <p>The resident suggests that the parking restrictions are reduced so that only that area immediately adjacent to the junction of Broadlands Court is included.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council appreciates the difficult parking situation in Broadlands Court, it has received a number of complaints with regards to the obstructive parking at the junction with Wokingham Road, which have been evidenced by a number of Officer site visits and observations. The extent of the parking restrictions represents the minimum lengths to ensure adequate visibility when leaving Broadlands Court and Warren Down, ensuring that parking is not moved to the Wokingham Road exit of the nearby Round Hill roundabout and that there is adequate room for cars to safely enter Broadlands Court.</p>	

		<p>However in view of the comments received we have reviewed the proposals and have amended them so to shorten the length they extend into Broadlands Court so allowing a small number of cars to continue to park in this location.</p>	
<p>X X XXXXXX Broadlands Court</p>	<p>X XXXXXX objects the proposed no waiting at any time restrictions on Wokingham Road until a solution can be found for the overpopulation and increase of vehicles in the area since the 1960's.</p> <p>Although X agrees that 15m of Wokingham Road either side of each junction should be no waiting, extending this into Broadlands Court and Warren Down only adds further to the displacement of cars. By adding 15m of no waiting into Broadlands Court means at least 7 vehicles will be pushed onto the main road. X states that this isn't a solution as it will just push the problem further afield or to the other side of the road. X suggests prohibiting the right hand turn out of Broadlands Court.</p> <p>X adds that the Council have been previously approached with regards to changing the land usage of the grassed area between Broadlands Court and Warren Down but this was turned down. Broadlands Court does not own all of this grass area and we would need planning permission and the landowners permission to make any changes.</p> <p>X adds that in addition to this parking, parking in the Rounds Hill area of Wokingham is bad but no changes are being proposed there. Cars are regularly parked fully on the footway blocking pedestrian access and hindering visibility, despite all of the car owners in this area having driveways & ample parking spaces.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council appreciates the difficult parking situation in Broadlands Court, it has received a number of complaints with regards to the obstructive parking at the junction with Wokingham Road, which have been evidenced by a number of Officer site visits and observations. The extent of the parking restrictions represents the minimum lengths to ensure adequate visibility when leaving Broadlands Court and Warren Down, ensuring that parking is not moved to the Wokingham Road exit of the nearby Round Hill roundabout and that there is adequate room for cars to safely enter Broadlands Court. However in view of the comments received we have reviewed the proposals and have amended them so to shorten the length they extend into Broadlands Court so allowing a small number of cars to continue to park in this location.</p> <p>The Council has looked at providing additional parking areas in Broadlands Court previously, but due to planning constraints and land ownership issues this was not able to be pursued further.</p> <p>The Council has investigated other parking issues along Wokingham Road previously however these have either been resolved by other means or the level of parking was not deemed to be at level that warranted the introduction of parking restrictions.</p>	<p>Modify proposals as shown on Drg 5287/002A</p>
<p>X X XXXXXX X Broadlands Court</p>	<p>X XXXXXX states that the proposed action is long overdue. X is disappointed that the Police have not taken any effective action against those who have clearly and repeatedly infringed basic road safety rules. X XXXXXX lists a number of Highway Code rules that X believes are being regularly broken.</p> <p>X suggests that the restrictions are added to the south side of Wokingham Road otherwise cars will surely park there forcing cars coming up the hill into the middle of the road causing a different type of danger. X adds that the restrictions will need to be enforced as people will flout them if not.</p> <p>X adds that there are 45 flats of which 37 have a single garage. The terms of the leases entitle leaseholders and tenants to park in their garages and prohibit them from parking on the access road (which is now adopted b the Council). The 11 parking bays in front of block 1 have a 3 hour maximum wait and are clearly for visitor parking.</p> <p>Most residents do not use their garages or are not able to as their landlords use them.</p>	<p>The residents comments supporting the proposals are noted.</p> <p>Further restrictions on the southern side of the road were considered, however given the level of displaced vehicles it is the Council's belief that owners will chose to continue to park on the northern side of the road at the end of new restrictions. However, as with any new parking restriction scheme the parking will be monitored and amendments/additions can be made in future traffic Regulation Order proposals.</p> <p>The Council has several Parking Enforcement Officers who have regular patrol routes that cover the majority of the Borough. Any new restrictions are usually given a high priority in enforcement in the first few weeks of their implementation. Residents are also able to contact the Council's Parking Enforcement Team to report parking issues which then can receive specific enforcement if resources allow.</p> <p>The Council has no authority with regards to the governance or enforcement of parking in private roads or parking areas. Whilst the Council sympathises with the resident it has no legal authority to involve itself in a private dispute.</p>	<p>Modify proposals as shown on Drg 5287/002A</p>

	<p>X XXXXX was advised by the Council that adoption of the access road did not change the legality of the prohibition of parking clause in the leases. The managing agent for the site disputes this and says they cannot enforce these rules now the road is adopted.</p> <p>There is currently no enforcement of any lease rules with regards to parking and garage use.</p> <p>While X XXXXXX supports the proposals X is worried that parking in Broadlands Court will get worse as residents are forced to park elsewhere. X asks for the Councils assistance in motivating the managing agents to enforce the parking and garage rules on the site.</p>		
<p>X X XXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXX X XX</p>	<p>XXXXXXXXX X XX XXX XXX XXXXXXXXX XXXXXX for the privately owned & maintained areas of Warren Down. They have enquired why the proposed restrictions extend past the adopted highway boundary and into the private section of Warren Down.</p>	<p>The proposals will be amended so that they extend into Warren Down and stop at the current boundary of the adopted highway.</p>	<p>Modify proposals as shown on Drg 5287/002A</p>

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr J Green – No comments received

Cllr A Finch – Thanks, that seems to tidy up the road well. I have had various complaints and observations about the roads and junctions there from residents.

Cllr P Brown – No further comment for now. I will keep an eye on how it goes.

Cllr J Harrison – Nothing to add.

Cllr I Leake – No comments received

Cllr A Shiv Bhandari – No comments received

OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Scheme:	BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 2) ORDER 2021 Watersplash Lane – Prohibition of waiting restrictions		
Date Advertised:	4.08.2021	No. of objections / comments received:	6

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify / Proceed as advertised.
X X XXXXXX XXXXXX XXXX Watersplash Lane	<p>X XXXXXX asks if anyone has taken any notice of the views of local residents when drawing up these proposals.</p> <p>X states at busy times cars parked by visitors to Windsor Great Park and particularly Cheapside School cause chaos for residents and through traffic. X adds during busy times cars park opposite X driveway making it impossible to access our driveways.</p> <p>X adds that all will happen if BFCs plans are implemented is that cars will park further up the road resulting in even more chaos than usual. X states the road is narrower and it is not uncommon for the White bus to be unable to pass parked cars. X states that all the plans will do is push the problem in RBWM.</p> <p>X XXXXXX states that as cars will not be able to park for the school drop off and pick up on the wider part of the road more children will have to exit vehicles on the narrow part of the road and then cross over to get to school.</p> <p>X suggests it would be better to put a car park for Windsor Great Park at the eastern end of the road. X states Crown Estates owns the fields on both sides of the road. X also suggests the school could be compelled to use a bus service for children deemed to live to far from the school to walk.</p> <p>X XXXXXX states that the consultation letter stated that RBWM had been consulted on the proposals but no reference to their take on the proposals is included.</p> <p>X XXXXXX states that this is the worst traffic easing plan X has ever seen and suggests it is a total non-starter and a waste of money. X suggests</p>	<p>The proposals have been designed following an increase in the number of vehicles parking on Watersplash Lane and visiting the Great Park. This parking has created a regular pattern of parking on the southern side of Watersplash Lane making it difficult to pass through the road. Discussions have been held with both Crown Estates and the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead (RBWM) and a joint parking restriction scheme was considered. However, RBWM were conscious that parking in the residential areas is at a premium and waiting restrictions may not be popular in these areas. It was therefore agreed that Bracknell Forest would advertise and, if agreed, install the restrictions in their section of Watersplash Lane and RBWM would then monitor the impact, and if necessary consult their residents on additional parking management solutions.</p> <p>Gaps have been left for parking which will still be able to be used by both visitors to the Great Park, and the school. These unrestricted areas afford drivers the gaps required to give way and pass safely. The parking areas, when used, will also create informal chicanes which may assist in reducing vehicle speeds.</p> <p>Schools have no authority with which to restrict the type of transport parents use to bring their children.</p>	Proceed as advertised

	that if no better solution can be found then doing nothing would be the best option.		
X X XXXXX Watersplash Lane	<p>X XXXXX wishes to object to the proposals.</p> <p>X adds that whilst the issues along Watersplash Lane has dramatically reduced post lockdown, the proposals would only push parking problems further along the lane.</p> <p>X XXXXX suggests we work with RBWM and double yellow line the road entirely (while allowing school time parking). X adds if this is not possible then no restrictions should be installed.</p>	<p>The proposals have been designed following an increase in the number of vehicles parking on Watersplash Lane and visiting the Great Park. This parking has created a regular pattern of parking on the southern side of Watersplash Lane making it difficult to pass through the road. Discussions have been held with both Crown Estates and the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead (RBWM) and a joint parking restriction scheme was considered. However, RBWM were conscious that parking in the residential areas is at a premium and waiting restrictions may not be popular in these areas. It was therefore agreed that Bracknell Forest would advertise and, if agreed, install the restrictions in their section of Watersplash Lane and RBWM would then monitor the impact, and if necessary consult their residents on additional parking management solutions.</p> <p>Gaps have been left for parking which will still be able to be used by both visitors to the Great Park, and the school. These unrestricted areas afford drivers the gaps required to give way and pass safely. The parking areas, when used, will also create informal chicanes which may assist in reducing vehicle speeds.</p>	Proceed as advertised
X X XXXXXX XXXX XXXXX Watersplash Lane	<p>X X X XXXXXX support any measure to limit parking in Watersplash Lane as the use of the road as a free car park for the great park has become excessive over the last year.</p> <p>However X adds that any measures must be linked to complimentary ones from RBWM otherwise the issues will simply be moved up the road. X adds that Dorian Drive is already jammed all day due to its use as a car park for Cheapside Primary School.</p> <p>X XXXXXX states that X has copied X response to X local RBWM councillor in an attempt to encourage collaborative thinking & planning.</p>	<p>The proposals have been designed following an increase in the number of vehicles parking on Watersplash Lane and visiting the Great Park. This parking has created a regular pattern of parking on the southern side of Watersplash Lane making it difficult to pass through the road. Discussions have been held with both Crown Estates and the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead (RBWM) and a joint parking restriction scheme was considered. However, RBWM were conscious that parking in the residential areas is at a premium and waiting restrictions may not be popular in these areas. It was therefore agreed that Bracknell Forest would advertise and, if agreed, install the restrictions in their section of Watersplash Lane and RBWM would then monitor the impact, and if necessary consult their residents on additional parking management solutions.</p> <p>Gaps have been left for parking which will still be able to be used by both visitors to the Great Park, and the school. These unrestricted areas afford drivers the gaps required to give way and pass safely. The parking areas, when used, will also create informal chicanes which may assist in reducing vehicle speeds.</p>	Proceed as advertised
X X X XXX XXXXXXXXX Watersplash Lane	<p>X X X XXX are not sure that the proposals will be helpful in that it will almost certainly shift parking to the western end of Watersplash Lane. They add that this area is characterised by houses with their own entry gates which must be kept clear, resulting in reduced parking density, resulting in reduced school parking meaning pupils will have further to walk.</p>	<p>The proposals have been designed following an increase in the number of vehicles parking on Watersplash Lane and visiting the Great Park. This parking has created a regular pattern of parking on the southern side of Watersplash Lane making it difficult to pass through the road. Discussions have been held with both Crown Estates and the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead (RBWM) and a joint parking</p>	Proceed as advertised

	<p>X X X XXX state that Cheapside School has circa 200 pupils most of whom are brought to school by car. They add that there is heavy congestion and parking in Watersplash Lane caused by commuter traffic, school drop off/pick ups and leisure traffic visiting the Great Park.</p> <p>X X X XXX suggest that school congestion could be reduced by the staggering pupil arrivals & departures, encouraging car sharing and encouraging walking to school. They also suggest that leisure parking could be eliminated by restricting parking between Buckhurst Road and Dorian Drive.</p> <p>They state that the plan to prohibit waiting on a large part of eastern end of Watersplash Lane is insane as it is the only sizeable area near to the school where school traffic can freely park.</p>	<p>restriction scheme was considered. However, RBWM were conscious that parking in the residential areas is at a premium and waiting restrictions may not be popular in these areas. It was therefore agreed that Bracknell Forest would advertise and, if agreed, install the restrictions in their section of Watersplash Lane and RBWM would then monitor the impact, and if necessary consult their residents on additional parking management solutions.</p> <p>Gaps have been left for parking which will still be able to be used by both visitors to the Great Park, and the school. These unrestricted areas afford drivers the gaps required to give way and pass safely. The parking areas, when used, will also create informal chicanes which may assist in reducing vehicle speeds.</p> <p>The school is outside the authority of Bracknell Forest but the comments/suggestions regarding school congestion will be passed to the relevant section at RBWM.</p>	
X XXXX X Dorian Drive	X XXXX is in agreement with the proposals and is pleased that something is being done at last in Watersplash Lane. X adds that X and other residents have been lobbying RBWM to resolve the parking problems there and in Dorian Drive for over 12 years.	Comments noted	Proceed as advertised
X X XXX X Dorian Drive	<p>X XXXX supports the proposals fully, however X adds that the existing double yellow lines at the junction of Sunninghill Road are still ignored especially by disabled drivers.</p> <p>At present cars parked on Watersplash reduce visibility when turning in from Sunninghill Road and these proposals will improve that.</p> <p>X concludes by praising the commitment of Bracknell Forest Council which is in stark comparison to RBWM who appear to not want to do anything in their area.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments regarding enforcement of the existing parking restrictions will be forwarded to the Council's Parking Enforcement Team for their information and action.</p> <p>Disabled badge holders are able to park on double yellow lines for a maximum of 3 hours; however this is dependent on their vehicle not causing an obstruction or a road safety hazard. Unfortunately the Council's Enforcement officers are unable to take action against the drivers in this instance as this authority lies with Thames Valley Police. If the proposed restrictions are installed, then should disabled drivers choose to exercise their right to park on them then they will be able to do so away from the junction.</p>	Proceed as advertised

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr M Gaw - My view is that the benefits outweigh the complaints. As with any highway scheme there you will never satisfy everyone.

Cllr T Virgo – No comments received

OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Scheme:	BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 2) ORDER 2021 Falcon Way – Prohibition of waiting restrictions		
Date Advertised:	4.08.2021	No. of objections / comments received:	1

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify / Proceed as advertised.
X X XXXXX X Falcon Way	<p>X XXXXX states that as a resident of Falcon Way, and often directly affected by the traffic, X is pleased that action is being taken and hopes the proposals are accepted.</p> <p>X has some questions on the proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will the double yellow lines just cover the bend (brickwork section)? Quite often cars parked all along to outside number 52 & 50 and XXX XXXXX encroaching driveways and making it impossible to pull out driveways. X is also concerned that users of the courts will just park further down Falcon Way. 2. X XXXXX asks if white lines can be parked across residents driveways to ensure access can be maintained. 3. X XXXXX believes that in the original plans for the development that bollards were to be placed to stop parking on the verges/footways. X asks if bollards could be added to stop residents parking on the footways. 4. X states that the paved areas outside the ball courts do not appear to be finished as, in particular, there are barriers around a tree and number of loose slabs dotted around. 5. Finally X asks how the restrictions will be monitored. X states that the restrictions outside the Co-Op are regularly parked on so X is concerned they will be ignored here too. When will the enforcement officers visit the site? 	<p>The restrictions on Falcon Way will cover the block paved area around the 90 degree bend. They have been proposed to keep this bend clear after observations have shown that parked vehicles are forcing cars onto the opposite side of the carriageway where there is reduced forward visibility.</p> <p>Parking so to obstruct a dropped kerb access can be enforced by the Council's Enforcement Officers and Thames Valley Police regardless of the presence of parking restrictions. This issue has been passed to the Council's Parking Enforcement Team for their information and action.</p> <p>The comments regarding the placement of bollards in the footway and the paved areas outside the ball courts have been passed to the Council's Adoptions & Development Team for their information and action.</p> <p>The Council has several Parking Enforcement Officers who have regular patrol routes that cover the majority of the Borough. Any new restrictions are usually given a high priority in enforcement in the first few weeks of their implementation. Residents are also able to contact the Council's Parking Enforcement Team to report parking issues which then can receive specific enforcement if resources allow.</p>	Proceed as advertised

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr M Temperton - Thank you

Cllr K Neill - Really pleased with this proposal.

OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Scheme:	BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 2) ORDER 2021 Broad Lane, Martins Lane & Sycamore Rise – Prohibition of waiting restrictions		
Date Advertised:	4.08.2021	No. of objections / comments received:	33

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify / Proceed as advertised.
X X XXXXXXXXX Sterling Square	<p>X XXXXXXXXX accepts that the Council have received complaints but asks if consideration has been given as to where the cars are going to park. X states there are lots of flats and houses in the area with a need to park their cars somewhere.</p> <p>X states X is not happy with these proposals and asks if alternative proposals could be considered.</p>	<p>The Council has received a number of complaints about parking in Broad Lane, particularly in relation to obstructed visibility when leaving driveways and obstructed footways. The Council has carried out its own checks on parking and this has shown that on average between 8-10 cars are regularly parking overnight and confirmed the issues being reported by residents.</p> <p>The Council has held discussions with Bellway Homes with regards to providing additional parking within the development, in particular allowing parking on the access road. Unfortunately no agreement could be reached leading the Council to consider further parking restrictions on Broad Lane to ensure the current safety and obstruction issues are removed.</p> <p>As the developer has fulfilled their requirements under the existing planning permission, the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site. Therefore, we would suggest that if residents of Sterling Square are unhappy with the parking provision or restrictions within the development, they approach the developers directly to see if any changes to the layout could be made or any flexibility in the rules be applied.</p> <p>Whilst the Council recognises the parking issues in the Sterling Square development, it also has the responsibility to ensure that traffic can flow freely and safely. Unfortunately, it is not the Councils primary duty or responsibility to make provision for vehicle parking on the public highway.</p>	Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures

		<p>As a result of the number of objections, we have again looked at the proposals to see if there are any areas of Broad Lane where parking can be left unrestricted. To that end it is proposed to remove the newly proposed double yellow lines from the southern side of Broad Lane between the Martins Lane Roundabout and Ralphs Ride Roundabout This will maintain parking for 4/5 cars. As observations indicate that there is between 8-10 vehicles that regularly park on Broad Lane and so could be displaced, this length of unrestricted parking, in an area considered safe to park, will assist in preventing displacement of parking vehicles in to side roads. No further options were identified where cars could be continued to be allowed park safely or where they could potentially park safely in future. It is expected that this additional length of unrestricted parking will provide parking for some, and so the number of displaced vehicles will be low, and shared across near by roads that are already parked in by local residents, will not cause any road safety issues.</p>	
<p>X X XXXXXXXXXXXX X Sterling Square</p>	<p>X XXXXXXXXXXXX states that introducing waiting restrictions on Broad Lane will not solve the problems but just push them further afield. The issue is caused by Sterling Square having insufficient parking.</p> <p>X adds that other councils suggest flats should have 3 spaces per 2 dwellings so Sterling Square should have 148 but it has 115. X states that by removing parking on Broad Lane we are making it impossible for people with more than 1 car to live there.</p> <p>X believes that that planning permission should never have been given as the site does not have enough parking for residents. The lack of parking is likely to devalue the properties over time. X adds that as the parking issue is caused by the Council's planning department it is up to the Council to provide adequate parking for the residents of Sterling Square. X suggests that that the grass area to the front of Sterling Square could be converted to a parking area.</p>	<p>The Council has received a number of complaints about parking in Broad Lane, particularly in relation to obstructed visibility when leaving driveways and obstructed footways. The Council has carried out its own checks on parking and this has shown that on average between 8-10 cars are regularly parking overnight and confirmed the issues being reported by residents.</p> <p>The parking standards applied to new developments do provide for flexibility in the level of provision required, and this would be subject to supporting evidence to justify the level of parking that would be sought by the applicant. In that respect, independent surveys were taken of the flatted developments in the vicinity of this site including the flatted elements of Sycamore Rise and Ogden Park to determine the likely parking demand from this scheme and the results from that supported the level of parking for the scale and tenure of the site at Sterling Square. The developer has fulfilled their requirements with regard to the planning permission and the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site</p> <p>The Council has held discussions with Bellway Homes with regards to providing additional parking within the development, in particular allowing parking on the access road. Unfortunately no agreement could be reached leading the Council to consider further parking restrictions on Broad Lane to ensure the current safety and obstruction issues are removed.</p> <p>As the developer has fulfilled their requirements under the existing planning permission, the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site. Therefore, we would suggest that if residents of Sterling Square are unhappy with the parking provision or restrictions within the development, they approach the developers</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>

		<p>directly to see if any changes to the layout could be made or any flexibility in the rules be applied.</p> <p>Providing a parking area between Sterling Square and Ogden Park has been investigated and is not feasible. This area forms the visibility splay for vehicles exiting both Sterling Square and Ogden Park and as a result needs to be kept clear of parked vehicles. Additionally, a parking facility in this position, if it were possible, would have introduced safety concerns regarding cars crossing a footway and would have resulted in the removal of the shared footway/cycleway facility that serves the development and surrounding area.</p> <p>Whilst the Council recognises the parking issues in the Sterling Square development, it also has the responsibility to ensure that traffic can flow freely and safely. Unfortunately, it is not the Councils primary duty or responsibility to make provision for vehicle parking on the public highway.</p>	
<p>XXXXXX XXXXXX Sterling Square</p>	<p>The resident is writing to object to the proposals as there will be insufficient parking and this will only push parking further down the roads and in turn further restrictions will be needed.</p> <p>As a resident of Sterling Square there should be more pressure put on Bellways who sold the properties with the promise of more parking but residents and their guests have no choice but to park in the adjacent roads.</p> <p>The resident states that the Council should be looking at safer ways for residents to park, not taking away the limited parking there is and creating more of an issue. The resident cites the example of new parking in Bay Road. If this is not an answer then more pressure should be applied to Bellways.</p> <p>The resident adds the Broad Lane is a very busy road with cars regularly racing down it with no care for speed limits and pedestrians. The cars parked there are a deterrent for speeding as they don't have a clear run.</p> <p>The resident asks us to reconsider these proposals.</p>	<p>The Council has received a number of complaints about parking in Broad Lane, particularly in relation to obstructed visibility when leaving driveways and obstructed footways. The Council has carried out its own checks on parking and this has shown that on average between 8-10 cars are regularly parking overnight and confirmed the issues being reported by residents.</p> <p>The parking standards applied to new developments do provide for flexibility in the level of provision required, and this would be subject to supporting evidence to justify the level of parking that would be sought by the applicant. In that respect, independent surveys were taken of the flatted developments in the vicinity of this site including the flatted elements of Sycamore Rise and Ogden Park to determine the likely parking demand from this scheme and the results from that supported the level of parking for the scale and tenure of the site at Sterling Square. The developer has fulfilled their requirements with regard to the planning permission and the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site</p> <p>The Council has held discussions with Bellway Homes with regards to providing additional parking within the development, in particular allowing parking on the access road. Unfortunately no agreement could be reached leading the Council to consider further parking restrictions on Broad Lane to ensure the current safety and obstruction issues are removed.</p> <p>As the developer has fulfilled their requirements under the existing planning permission, the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site. Therefore, we would suggest that if residents of Sterling Square are unhappy with the parking provision or restrictions within the development, they approach the developers</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>

		<p>directly to see if any changes to the layout could be made or any flexibility in the rules be applied.</p> <p>Whilst the Council recognises the parking issues in the Sterling Square development, it also has the responsibility to ensure that traffic can flow freely and safely. Unfortunately, it is not the Councils primary duty or responsibility to make provision for vehicle parking on the public highway.</p>	
<p>X X XXXXXX Sterling Square</p>	<p>X XXXXXX objects to the increase of parking restrictions in Broad Lane, Sycamore Rise & Martins Lane.</p> <p>X is a home owner in Sterling Square and was sold the property by Bellway with the added bonus of street parking. X adds the Council approved planning permission for this development knowing the lack of parking would be an issue. X adds the volume of cars will not disappear with over 100 flats with just 1 parking space each. X feels that the Council should have stepped in earlier at the planning permission stage to recognise the issues this would cause before taking the money. X states that not being able to have visitors due to lack of parking will effect X and other people's mental health.</p> <p>X suggests that there are many grassed areas outside and within Sterling Square where extra parking could be created and the Council should have fought harder to make this happen.</p> <p>X concludes that adding double yellow lines to the proposed areas will just push cars further up the roads and congest other areas, this is not solving the problem, just pushing them elsewhere.</p>	<p>The Council has received a number of complaints about parking in Broad Lane, particularly in relation to obstructed visibility when leaving driveways and obstructed footways. The Council has carried out its own checks on parking and this has shown that on average between 8-10 cars are regularly parking overnight and confirmed the issues being reported by residents.</p> <p>The parking standards applied to new developments do provide for flexibility in the level of provision required, and this would be subject to supporting evidence to justify the level of parking that would be sought by the applicant. In that respect, independent surveys were taken of the flatted developments in the vicinity of this site including the flatted elements of Sycamore Rise and Ogden Park to determine the likely parking demand from this scheme and the results from that supported the level of parking for the scale and tenure of the site at Sterling Square. The developer has fulfilled their requirements with regard to the planning permission and the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site</p> <p>The Council has held discussions with Bellway Homes with regards to providing additional parking within the development, in particular allowing parking on the access road. Unfortunately no agreement could be reached leading the Council to consider further parking restrictions on Broad Lane to ensure the current safety and obstruction issues are removed.</p> <p>As the developer has fulfilled their requirements under the existing planning permission, the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site. Therefore, we would suggest that if residents of Sterling Square are unhappy with the parking provision or restrictions within the development, they approach the developers directly to see if any changes to the layout could be made or any flexibility in the rules be applied.</p> <p>Providing a parking area between Sterling Square and Ogden Park has been investigated and is not feasible. This area forms the visibility splay for vehicles exiting both Sterling Square and Ogden Park and as a result needs to be kept clear of parked vehicles. Additionally, a parking facility in this position, if it were possible, would have introduced safety concerns regarding cars crossing a footway and would have resulted in</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>

		<p>the removal of the shared footway/cycleway facility that serves the development and surrounding area.</p> <p>Whilst the Council recognises the parking issues in the Sterling Square development, it also has the responsibility to ensure that traffic can flow freely and safely. Unfortunately, it is not the Councils primary duty or responsibility to make provision for vehicle parking on the public highway.</p>	
<p>XXXXXXXX & XXXXXX Sterling Square</p>	<p>The residents state they are aware that the new development has brought new car traffic into the area and they appreciate the concerns of residents regarding getting into & out of their driveways. They add they have complained to the developers about little thought being given to parking provision in the planning process. They state they were all told there would be one space per flat but at that time there was plenty of on-street parking available for those with two cars.</p> <p>They add that they do not see adding parking restrictions as a constructive solution as ultimately they need somewhere to park their vehicles.</p> <p>They ask what has been discussed with the developers and is there anyway that the residents can put further pressure on them. They suggest putting in marked bays with permit restrictions.</p>	<p>The Council has received a number of complaints about parking in Broad Lane, particularly in relation to obstructed visibility when leaving driveways and obstructed footways. The Council has carried out its own checks on parking and this has shown that on average between 8-10 cars are regularly parking overnight and confirmed the issues being reported by residents.</p> <p>The parking standards applied to new developments do provide for flexibility in the level of provision required, and this would be subject to supporting evidence to justify the level of parking that would be sought by the applicant. In that respect, independent surveys were taken of the flatted developments in the vicinity of this site including the flatted elements of Sycamore Rise and Ogden Park to determine the likely parking demand from this scheme and the results from that supported the level of parking for the scale and tenure of the site at Sterling Square. The developer has fulfilled their requirements with regard to the planning permission and the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site</p> <p>The Council has held discussions with Bellway Homes with regards to providing additional parking within the development, in particular allowing parking on the access road. Unfortunately no agreement could be reached leading the Council to consider further parking restrictions on Broad Lane to ensure the current safety and obstruction issues are removed.</p> <p>As the developer has fulfilled their requirements under the existing planning permission, the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site. Therefore, we would suggest that if residents of Sterling Square are unhappy with the parking provision or restrictions within the development, they approach the developers directly to see if any changes to the layout could be made or any flexibility in the rules be applied.</p> <p>Whilst the Council recognises the parking issues in the Sterling Square development, it also has the responsibility to ensure that traffic can flow freely and safely. Unfortunately, it is not the Councils primary duty or responsibility to make provision for vehicle parking on the public highway.</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>

<p>X XXXXXXXXX Sterling Square</p>	<p>X XXXXXXXXX states that X lives in Sterling Square and whilst X understands the concerns, X asks what other solutions have been discussed with developer.</p> <p>X adds that the proposed restrictions will have a significant impact on residents who have already been let down by Bellway Homes decision to provide a mere 10 visitor bays for 100 flats.</p> <p>X asks if it is possible to implement some form of consultation with residents to find alternatives?</p>	<p>The Council has received a number of complaints about parking in Broad Lane, particularly in relation to obstructed visibility when leaving driveways and obstructed footways. The Council has carried out its own checks on parking and this has shown that on average between 8-10 cars are regularly parking overnight and confirmed the issues being reported by residents.</p> <p>The parking standards applied to new developments do provide for flexibility in the level of provision required, and this would be subject to supporting evidence to justify the level of parking that would be sought by the applicant. In that respect, independent surveys were taken of the flatted developments in the vicinity of this site including the flatted elements of Sycamore Rise and Ogden Park to determine the likely parking demand from this scheme and the results from that supported the level of parking for the scale and tenure of the site at Sterling Square. The developer has fulfilled their requirements with regard to the planning permission and the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site</p> <p>The Council has held discussions with Bellway Homes with regards to providing additional parking within the development, in particular allowing parking on the access road. Unfortunately no agreement could be reached leading the Council to consider further parking restrictions on Broad Lane to ensure the current safety and obstruction issues are removed.</p> <p>As the developer has fulfilled their requirements under the existing planning permission, the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site. Therefore, we would suggest that if residents of Sterling Square are unhappy with the parking provision or restrictions within the development, they approach the developers directly to see if any changes to the layout could be made or any flexibility in the rules be applied.</p> <p>Whilst the Council recognises the parking issues in the Sterling Square development, it also has the responsibility to ensure that traffic can flow freely and safely. Unfortunately, it is not the Councils primary duty or responsibility to make provision for vehicle parking on the public highway.</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>
<p>X X XXXXX Sterling Square</p>	<p>X XXXXX objects to the proposals although understands why they are being proposed.</p> <p>X XXXXX only has one car so is contributing to the issue but a large number of the residents have 2 or more cars so the Council would have been aware of this when planning permission was granted. X states X appreciates that additional planning permission would be needed to increase the parking provision on the site.</p> <p>X adds that the visitor bays are parked in for the majority of time by residents second cars so visitors are forced to park on the highway.</p>	<p>The Council has received a number of complaints about parking in Broad Lane, particularly in relation to obstructed visibility when leaving driveways and obstructed footways. The Council has carried out its own checks on parking and this has shown that on average between 8-10 cars are regularly parking overnight and confirmed the issues being reported by residents.</p> <p>The parking standards applied to new developments do provide for flexibility in the level of provision required, and this would be subject to supporting evidence to justify the level of parking that would be sought</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>

X XXXXX states that Bellway approached the Council to buy the slip road and grassed area in front of the development to provide additional parking. X believes the Council were unwilling to negotiate to sell the land as parking but at a development cost so no agreement could be reached. X finds it strange as the land could have provided more parking and removed from the Council's responsibility and expense in maintaining.

X adds that the refusal to sell the land has led to an additional 20+ cars parking on Broad Lane and surrounding roads. X appreciates that parking restrictions will help the residents that are being affected but X feels they will be moving the problems further and then further restrictions will be needed etc. X suggest that some areas could have a single yellow restriction and keep double yellows in places where parking would be unsafe.

by the applicant. In that respect, independent surveys were taken of the flatted developments in the vicinity of this site including the flatted elements of Sycamore Rise and Ogden Park to determine the likely parking demand from this scheme and the results from that supported the level of parking for the scale and tenure of the site at Sterling Square. The developer has fulfilled their requirements with regard to the planning permission and the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site

The Council has held discussions with Bellway Homes with regards to providing additional parking within the development, in particular allowing parking on the access road. Unfortunately no agreement could be reached leading the Council to consider further parking restrictions on Broad Lane to ensure the current safety and obstruction issues are removed.

As the developer has fulfilled their requirements under the existing planning permission, the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site. Therefore, we would suggest that if residents of Sterling Square are unhappy with the parking provision or restrictions within the development, they approach the developers directly to see if any changes to the layout could be made or any flexibility in the rules be applied.

Providing a parking area between Sterling Square and Ogden Park has been investigated and is not feasible. This area forms the visibility splay for vehicles exiting both Sterling Square and Ogden Park and as a result needs to be kept clear of parked vehicles. Additionally, a parking facility in this position, if it were possible, would have introduced safety concerns regarding cars crossing a footway and would have resulted in the removal of the shared footway/cycleway facility that serves the development and surrounding area.

Whilst the Council recognises the parking issues in the Sterling Square development, it also has the responsibility to ensure that traffic can flow freely and safely. Unfortunately, it is not the Councils primary duty or responsibility to make provision for vehicle parking on the public highway.

As a result of the number of objections, we have again looked at the proposals to see if there are any areas of Broad Lane where parking can be left unrestricted. To that end it is proposed to remove the newly proposed double yellow lines from the southern side of Broad Lane between the Martins Lane Roundabout and Ralphs Ride Roundabout This will maintain parking for 4/5 cars. As observations indicate that there is between 8-10 vehicles that regularly park on Broad Lane and so could be displaced, this length of unrestricted parking, in an area considered safe to park, will assist in preventing displacement of parking vehicles in to side roads. No further options were identified where cars could be continued to be allowed park safely or where they

		could potentially park safely in future. It is expected that this additional length of unrestricted parking will provide parking for some, and so the number of displaced vehicles will be low, and shared across near by roads that are already parked in by local residents, will not cause any road safety issues.	
XX XXXXXX Sterling Square	<p>X XXXXXX does not think it would be fair to introduce the parking restrictions given how limited parking is already. X states X has never seen any vehicles obstructing driveways on Broad Lane.</p> <p>X states X is 33 weeks pregnant and asks where will X be able to park nearby. X does not think it is safe to ask people to park miles away from their homes.</p>	<p>The Council has received a number of complaints about parking in Broad Lane, particularly in relation to obstructed visibility when leaving driveways and obstructed footways. The Council has carried out its own checks on parking and this has shown that on average between 8-10 cars are regularly parking overnight and confirmed the issues being reported by residents.</p> <p>The parking standards applied to new developments do provide for flexibility in the level of provision required, and this would be subject to supporting evidence to justify the level of parking that would be sought by the applicant. In that respect, independent surveys were taken of the flatted developments in the vicinity of this site including the flatted elements of Sycamore Rise and Ogden Park to determine the likely parking demand from this scheme and the results from that supported the level of parking for the scale and tenure of the site at Sterling Square. The developer has fulfilled their requirements with regard to the planning permission and the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site</p> <p>The Council has held discussions with Bellway Homes with regards to providing additional parking within the development, in particular allowing parking on the access road. Unfortunately no agreement could be reached leading the Council to consider further parking restrictions on Broad Lane to ensure the current safety and obstruction issues are removed.</p> <p>As the developer has fulfilled their requirements under the existing planning permission, the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site. Therefore, we would suggest that if residents of Sterling Square are unhappy with the parking provision or restrictions within the development, they approach the developers directly to see if any changes to the layout could be made or any flexibility in the rules be applied.</p> <p>Whilst the Council recognises the parking issues in the Sterling Square development, it also has the responsibility to ensure that traffic can flow freely and safely. Unfortunately, it is not the Councils primary duty or responsibility to make provision for vehicle parking on the public highway.</p>	Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures
X X Sterling Square	The resident agrees that parking is a nightmare however does not feel the proposed changes are the solution.	The Council has received a number of complaints about parking in Broad Lane, particularly in relation to obstructed visibility when leaving driveways and obstructed footways. The Council has carried out its own	Place proposals on hold pending

	<p>The resident states the Council claim to have discussed freeing more parking with the developers but it was clear this would not be possible. X adds that that the Bracknell Forest parking standards states that visitor parking spaces should be 1 space per 5 units. As the development consists of 100 flats this means there should be 20 visitor bays but there are only 16 so this does not meet the Councils standards.</p> <p>The resident states there is a grassed verge in front of Sterling Square which could be turned into parking bays to support the development and other local residents. Has this been looked into?</p> <p>X asks what solutions can be found rather than just imposing parking restrictions which don't make this issue go away but moves and increases stress for residents involved.</p>	<p>checks on parking and this has shown that on average between 8-10 cars are regularly parking overnight and confirmed the issues being reported by residents.</p> <p>The parking standards applied to new developments do provide for flexibility in the level of provision required, and this would be subject to supporting evidence to justify the level of parking that would be sought by the applicant. In that respect, independent surveys were taken of the flatted developments in the vicinity of this site including the flatted elements of Sycamore Rise and Ogden Park to determine the likely parking demand from this scheme and the results from that supported the level of parking for the scale and tenure of the site at Sterling Square. The developer has fulfilled their requirements with regard to the planning permission and the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site</p> <p>The Council has held discussions with Bellway Homes with regards to providing additional parking within the development, in particular allowing parking on the access road. Unfortunately no agreement could be reached leading the Council to consider further parking restrictions on Broad Lane to ensure the current safety and obstruction issues are removed.</p> <p>As the developer has fulfilled their requirements under the existing planning permission, the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site. Therefore, we would suggest that if residents of Sterling Square are unhappy with the parking provision or restrictions within the development, they approach the developers directly to see if any changes to the layout could be made or any flexibility in the rules be applied.</p> <p>Providing a parking area between Sterling Square and Ogden Park has been investigated and is not feasible. This area forms the visibility splay for vehicles exiting both Sterling Square and Ogden Park and as a result needs to be kept clear of parked vehicles. Additionally, a parking facility in this position, if it were possible, would have introduced safety concerns regarding cars crossing a footway and would have resulted in the removal of the shared footway/cycleway facility that serves the development and surrounding area.</p> <p>Whilst the Council recognises the parking issues in the Sterling Square development, it also has the responsibility to ensure that traffic can flow freely and safely. Unfortunately, it is not the Councils primary duty or responsibility to make provision for vehicle parking on the public highway.</p>	<p>investigation into further mitigation measures</p>
<p>X X XXXXXX Martins Lane</p>	<p>X XXXXXX is a resident of Martins Lane and X is deeply concerned with the impending parking restrictions around Broad Lane & Quadrant Court which X feels will further impact parking on the road.</p>	<p>The parking standards applied to new developments do provide for flexibility in the level of provision required, and this would be subject to supporting evidence to justify the level of parking that would be sought by the applicant. In that respect, independent surveys were taken of</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation</p>

	<p>X states that during the week day, parking isn't an issue but during the evening & weekends parking can be very busy. Residents are lucky as they can park on their driveway but visitors would have nowhere to park.</p> <p>X adds that surely parking should have been taken into account for the new development in Broad Lane. X knows of some families in the development who have 2 cars but only 1 parking space. X states X often sees residents from the flats parking in Martins Lane on a Friday evening and then not leaving until Monday morning. X believes these issues will only get worse if the proposals go ahead.</p>	<p>the flatted developments in the vicinity of this site including the flatted elements of Sycamore Rise and Ogden Park to determine the likely parking demand from this scheme and the results from that supported the level of parking for the scale and tenure of the site at Sterling Square. The developer has fulfilled their requirements with regard to the planning permission and the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site</p> <p>The Council has held discussions with Bellway Homes with regards to providing additional parking within the development, in particular allowing parking on the access road. Unfortunately no agreement could be reached leading the Council to consider further parking restrictions on Broad Lane to ensure the current safety and obstruction issues are removed.</p> <p>As the developer has fulfilled their requirements under the existing planning permission, the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site. Therefore, we would suggest that if residents of Sterling Square are unhappy with the parking provision or restrictions within the development, they approach the developers directly to see if any changes to the layout could be made or any flexibility in the rules be applied.</p> <p>Whilst the Council appreciates the residents comments regarding Sterling Square residents parking in Martins Lane; it should also be noted that Martins Lane is a adopted road therefore provided they do so in a safe and non-obstructive manner any motorist is able to park there legally. Indeed, the residents of Martins Lane regularly park on street themselves. However, the amendment to the proposals maintaining some on street parking in Broad Lane near Martins Lane should reduce the number of vehicles being displaced.</p> <p>Parking surveys carried out over the last year have consistently shown on-street parking on Martins Lane between Broad Lane and Quadrant Court. However, the rest of the road remains largely free of parked cars.</p> <p>It is anticipated that a number of the vehicles currently parking on Broad Lane will be displaced into Martins Lane but at present there remains adequate on-street parking space for them. Measures to protect the junctions of Quadrant Court and Northampton Close were included in the proposals.</p>	<p>into further mitigation measures</p>
<p>X X X XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX X X Martins Lane</p>	<p>X X X XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX have lived in Martins Lane for X years and they have put up with constant building work in the Broad Lane area. They add that poor planning in not having adequate parking for all the projects have effected Martins Lane considerably for years.</p> <p>They state that the proposals will not help Martins Lane at all and they are already taking the overspill parking from nearby areas. Their road used to be a very quiet residential road but is now congested, noisy, problematic</p>	<p>The parking standards applied to new developments do provide for flexibility in the level of provision required, and this would be subject to supporting evidence to justify the level of parking that would be sought by the applicant. In that respect, independent surveys were taken of the flatted developments in the vicinity of this site including the flatted elements of Sycamore Rise and Ogden Park to determine the likely parking demand from this scheme and the results from that supported the level of parking for the scale and tenure of the site at Sterling</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>

	<p>and is becoming quite unpleasant to live in with traffic, crime, congestion, noise. Flooding which are all as a result of decisions by poor representatives who frankly do not represent our interests.</p> <p>They add with these proposals they will continue to overlook unknown vehicles from their window and will continue to have to negotiate getting out of their drive, manoeuvring through double parkers and possibly having altercations with people that don't even live in the road. Any visitors to us, struggle to find a parking spot in the area. This congestion will inevitably devalue our properties.</p> <p>They do not support our proposals and suggest you go back to the drawing board to remedy the mess you have created and allowed. Assuming the proposals went ahead, how often would they be monitored and would they be enforced? What about options like double yellow lines/permits/repurposing the St John's Ambulance parking area – have these been explored? Martins Lane residents are tired of the disruption your decision making has caused.</p>	<p>Square. The developer has fulfilled their requirements with regard to the planning permission and the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site</p> <p>The Council has held discussions with Bellway Homes with regards to providing additional parking within the development, in particular allowing parking on the access road. Unfortunately no agreement could be reached leading the Council to consider further parking restrictions on Broad Lane to ensure the current safety and obstruction issues are removed.</p> <p>As the developer has fulfilled their requirements under the existing planning permission, the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site. Therefore, we would suggest that if residents of Sterling Square are unhappy with the parking provision or restrictions within the development, they approach the developers directly to see if any changes to the layout could be made or any flexibility in the rules be applied.</p> <p>Whilst the Council appreciates the residents comments regarding Sterling Square residents parking in Martins Lane; it should also be noted that Martins Lane is a adopted road therefore provided they do so in a safe and non-obstructive manner any motorist is able to park there legally. Indeed, the residents of Martins Lane regularly park on street themselves. However, the amendment to the proposals maintaining some on street parking in Broad Lane near Martins Lane should reduce the number of vehicles being displaced.</p> <p>Parking surveys carried out over the last year have consistently shown on-street parking on Martins Lane between Broad Lane and Quadrant Court. However, the rest of the road remains largely free of parked cars.</p> <p>As a result of the number of objections, we have again looked at the proposals to see if there are any areas of Broad Lane where parking can be left unrestricted. To that end it is proposed to remove the newly proposed double yellow lines from the southern side of Broad Lane between the Martins Lane Roundabout and Ralphs Ride Roundabout This will maintain parking for 4/5 cars. As observations indicate that there is between 8-10 vehicles that regularly park on Broad Lane and so could be displaced, this length of unrestricted parking, in an area considered safe to park, will assist in preventing displacement of parking vehicles in to side roads. No further options were identified where cars could be continued to be allowed park safely or where they could potentially park safely in future. It is expected that this additional length of unrestricted parking will provide parking for some, and so the number of displaced vehicles will be low, and shared across near by roads that are already parked in by local residents, will not cause any road safety issues.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Residents parking/permit schemes are designed to protect communities from competition for kerb side parking, generated by a large nearby source such as a railway station or retail development. The exiting residents parking scheme allows residents to have up to 5 permits per property together with visitor permits as the scheme is not intended to limit the number of vehicles residents may have, but to protect fro outside parking demands. These permits are charged for. Additionally, residents parking schemes (such as the one in operation around Bracknell town centre) makes allowances for adjoining/nearby roads and developments by creating residents parking zones, and so it is likely that Sterling Square would be included in such a zone if such a scheme was ever considered for the Broad Lane/Martins Lane/Sycamore Rise area. Therefore the introduction of residents parking scheme is unlikely to reduce the demand for parking spaces but would add a cost for parking to the existing residents. Residents parking is therefore not considered a suitable solution</p>	
<p>X X XXXXXXXX X Martins Lane</p>	<p>X XXXXXXXX does not agree with the proposals. X adds X is fed up of the Council approving inadequate parking and then pushing the inevitable parking issues on to local residents.</p> <p>X states that Martins Lane has for some time been used for excess parking from Quadrant Court, Brattain Court and now Sterling Square. X states X house is near to the roundabout so I don't have to run the gauntlet for too far. X adds it is already a nightmare turning into Martins Lane due to the line of parked cars that are parked just inside it.</p> <p>X states that X came home in the evening on Sat 28th Aug and the road was full of parked cars.</p> <p>X adds that Sterling Square flats are not cheap and it is highly likely that 2 incomes are needed to afford one and the chances of one of those incomes coming from within walking distance is highly unlikely. Allowing 1.5 parking spaces per property is ridiculous.</p> <p>X asks if the whole of Broad Lane is double yellow lined then where will those extra cars go? Where will the staff for Ballcock & Bits park?</p> <p>X XXXXXXXX asks for a better option to be considered. X suggests that the area in front of Sterling Square could be converted to parking similar to those recently installed in Bay Road. X adds that the area opposite Ballcock & Bits could be converted to more parking.</p> <p>X XXXXXXXX again asks the Council to stop approving developments with inadequate parking and cites an example of a new town centre development with 377 flats but only 420 parking spaces.</p>	<p>The parking standards applied to new developments do provide for flexibility in the level of provision required, and this would be subject to supporting evidence to justify the level of parking that would be sought by the applicant. In that respect, independent surveys were taken of the flatted developments in the vicinity of this site including the flatted elements of Sycamore Rise and Ogden Park to determine the likely parking demand from this scheme and the results from that supported the level of parking for the scale and tenure of the site at Sterling Square. The developer has fulfilled their requirements with regard to the planning permission and the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site</p> <p>The Council has held discussions with Bellway Homes with regards to providing additional parking within the development, in particular allowing parking on the access road. Unfortunately no agreement could be reached leading the Council to consider further parking restrictions on Broad Lane to ensure the current safety and obstruction issues are removed.</p> <p>As the developer has fulfilled their requirements under the existing planning permission, the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site. Therefore, we would suggest that if residents of Sterling Square are unhappy with the parking provision or restrictions within the development, they approach the developers directly to see if any changes to the layout could be made or any flexibility in the rules be applied.</p> <p>Providing a parking area between Sterling Square and Ogden Park has been investigated and is not feasible. This area forms the visibility splay for vehicles exiting both Sterling Square and Ogden Park and as a result needs to be kept clear of parked vehicles. Additionally, a parking facility in this position, if it were possible, would have introduced safety concerns regarding cars crossing a footway and would have resulted in</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>

		<p>the removal of the shared footway/cycleway facility that serves the development and surrounding area.</p> <p>Whilst the Council appreciates the residents comments regarding Sterling Square residents parking in Martins Lane; it should also be noted that Martins Lane is a adopted road therefore provided they do so in a safe and non-obstructive manner any motorist is able to park there legally. Indeed, the residents of Martins Lane regularly park on street themselves. However, the amendment to the proposals maintaining some on street parking in Broad Lane near Martins Lane should reduce the number of vehicles being displaced.</p> <p>Parking surveys carried out over the last year have consistently shown high levels of on-street parking on Martins Lane between Broad Lane and Quadrant Court. However, the rest of the road remains largely free of parked cars.</p> <p>It is anticipated that a number of the vehicles currently parking on Broad Lane will be displaced into Martins Lane but at present there remains adequate on-street parking space for them. Measures to protect the junctions of Quadrant Court and Northampton Close were included in the proposals.</p> <p>Residents parking/permit schemes are designed to protect communities from competition for kerb side parking, generated by a large nearby source such as a railway station or retail development. The exiting residents parking scheme allows residents to have up to 5 permits per property together with visitor permits as the scheme is not intended to limit the number of vehicles residents may have, but to protect from outside parking demands. These permits are charged for. Additionally, residents parking schemes (such as the one in operation around Bracknell town centre) makes allowances for adjoining/nearby roads and developments by creating residents parking zones, and so it is likely that Sterling Square would be included in such a zone if such a scheme was ever considered for the Broad Lane/Martins Lane/Sycamore Rise area. Therefore the introduction of residents parking scheme is unlikely to reduce the demand for parking spaces but would add a cost for parking to the existing residents. Residents parking is therefore not considered a suitable solution</p>	
<p>X X XXXXX Martins Lane</p>	<p>X XXXXX is a resident of Martins Lane and feels the proposed restrictions are not sufficient. X feels that by protecting the junctions of Quadrant Court & Northampton Close parked vehicles will be sent closer to X & X neighbours properties.</p> <p>X adds that they have had parking issues since Sterling Square was completed and during the Covid lockdown cars were parked in Martins Lane for several days at a time.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council appreciates the residents comments regarding Sterling Square residents parking in Martins Lane; it should also be noted that Martins Lane is a adopted road therefore provided they do so in a safe and non-obstructive manner any motorist is able to park there legally. Indeed, the residents of Martins Lane regularly park on street themselves. However, the amendment to the proposals maintaining some on street parking in Broad Lane near Martins Lane should reduce the number of vehicles being displaced.</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>

	<p>X states that vehicles are always parked on the footway which means pedestrians have to walk on the road.</p>	<p>Parking surveys carried out over the last year have consistently shown high levels of on-street parking on Martins Lane between Broad Lane and Quadrant Court. However, the rest of the road remains largely free of parked cars.</p> <p>It is anticipated that a number of the vehicles currently parking on Broad Lane will be displaced into Martins Lane but at present there remains adequate on-street parking space for them. Measures to protect the junctions of Quadrant Court and Northampton Close were included in the proposals.</p>	
<p>X X XXXXXXXX X Martins Lane</p>	<p>X XXXXXXXX writes to bring some matters to our attention. X states that X has lived in Martins Lane for 27 years. X adds that during the construction of Sterling Square they had issues with tradesmen using our road as a car park, so much that sometimes X could not access his driveway. Since completion there have been 10 regular cars parked on Martins Lane owned by residents of Sterling Square.</p> <p>X XXXXXXXX states that X has been in contact with the Council about this issue and was told that the cars would naturally disperse in time but this has not happened as they have nowhere else to go. X XXXXXXXX adds that parking in Martins Lane has further been affected by the introduction of parking restrictions in Quadrant Court so the overspill are parking in Martins Lane. X XXXXXXXX also points out that X and a number of other Martins Lane residents have grown up children who have cars that need somewhere to park. X states that that regularly when his daughter arrives home from work they have nowhere to park and have to park at the end of the road which will not be good in the winter/dark.</p> <p>X states that when the yellow lines are installed in Broad Lane the cars that currently park there will be forced to park in Martins Lane and the staff from Ballcock & Bits have already said they will park here too.</p> <p>X states that Broad Lane has become quite dangerous due to the parked cars but there must be a better option than putting double yellow lines everywhere.</p> <p>X adds that if the double yellow lines go ahead then X would welcome a permit parking scheme in Martins Lane to avoid the inevitable parking problems that will be introduced,</p> <p>X states that these parking restrictions have become necessary because of the totally inadequate parking allowed for in Sterling Square. The developers have no idea how people live their lives, most couples have two cars but the development allows just one per flat.</p> <p>X XXXXXXXX asks that the Council look carefully at the effects these restrictions will have on long standing residents and avoid a solution that will result in a horrendous parking problem and unpleasant confrontations.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council appreciates the residents comments regarding Sterling Square residents parking in Martins Lane; it should also be noted that Martins Lane is a adopted road therefore provided they do so in a safe and non-obstructive manner any motorist is able to park there legally. Indeed, the residents of Martins Lane regularly park on street themselves. However, the amendment to the proposals maintaining some on street parking in Broad Lane near Martins Lane should reduce the number of vehicles being displaced.</p> <p>Parking surveys carried out over the last year have consistently shown high levels of on-street parking on Martins Lane between Broad Lane and Quadrant Court. However, the rest of the road remains largely free of parked cars.</p> <p>It is anticipated that a number of the vehicles currently parking on Broad Lane will be displaced into Martins Lane but at present there remains adequate on-street parking space for them. Measures to protect the junctions of Quadrant Court and Northampton Close were included in the proposals.</p> <p>Residents parking/permit schemes are designed to protect communities from competition for kerb side parking, generated by a large nearby source such as a railway station or retail development. The exiting residents parking scheme allows residents to have up to 5 permits per property together with visitor permits as the scheme is not intended to limit the number of vehicles residents may have, but to protect fro outside parking demands. These permits are charged for. Additionally, residents parking schemes (such as the one in operation around Bracknell town centre) makes allowances for adjoining/nearby roads and developments by creating residents parking zones, and so it is likely that Sterling Square would be included in such a zone if such a scheme was ever considered for the Broad Lane/Martins Lane/Sycamore Rise area. Therefore the introduction of residents parking scheme is unlikely to reduce the demand for parking spaces but would add a cost for parking to the existing residents. Residents parking is therefore not considered a suitable solution</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>

	<p>X adds that again that the residents are all happy to go to a permit parking system so only residents can park in the road.</p>	<p>The parking restrictions have been developed based on the assumption that parked vehicles will 'migrate' to other areas hence the scale & length of the restrictions. A review of the proposals has been undertaken following the consultation and following this a section of restrictions to the north of Martins Lane has been removed. It is felt that continuing to allow vehicles to park in this location does not significantly effect the road safety in it's vicinity and may alleviate some the effects of the other restrictions. No further options were identified where cars could be continued to be allowed park safely or where they could potentially park safely in future.</p>	
<p>X X XXXXXX X Martins Lane</p>	<p>X XXXXXX states that X can see huge problems for the residents of Martins Lane who live near the end of the cul-de-sac. X adds they have already opposed the planning application for the detached house to be demolished and multiple houses to be built as this would increase the parking problem.</p> <p>X states that residents of Ralphs Ride already park in Martins Lane as there is insufficient parking allocated for them. Patients visiting the nearby Doctors surgery also park & walk under the bridge. A recent change of usage at 1 house has led to extra cars parking whilst their dogs are trained & treated.</p> <p>X states that all the proposals will do is push more vehicles down to the end of Martins Lane. X adds that every house that has been demolished in Broad Lane & the surrounding areas have been replaced by flats/apartments etc and they have been passed without insisting on adequate parking. Everytime cars have been forced onto the public highway.</p> <p>X asks when will this stop?</p>	<p>Whilst the Council appreciates the residents comments regarding Sterling Square residents parking in Martins Lane; it should also be noted that Martins Lane is a adopted road therefore provided they do so in a safe and non-obstructive manner any motorist is able to park there legally. Indeed, the residents of Martins Lane regularly park on street themselves. However, the amendment to the proposals maintaining some on street parking in Broad Lane near Martins Lane should reduce the number of vehicles being displaced.</p> <p>Parking surveys carried out over the last year have consistently shown high levels of on-street parking on Martins Lane between Broad Lane and Quadrant Court. However, the rest of the road remains largely free of parked cars.</p> <p>It is anticipated that a number of the vehicles currently parking on Broad Lane will be displaced into Martins Lane but at present there remains adequate on-street parking space for them. Measures to protect the junctions of Quadrant Court and Northampton Close were included in the proposals.</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>
<p>X X XXXXXXXX X Broad Lane</p>	<p>X XXXXXXXX wishes to convey his thoughts on the current parking situation, our proposals and the effects it has on X XXXXXXXX.</p> <p>At present XXXXX XXXXX park on the roadside next to the stop, to leave the drive available for XXX XXXXXXXXXX. This never used to be an issue, however in recent years they are struggling to get our cars parked as more and more close by residents are parking their cars along Broad Lane, and then we are forced to park in Martins Lane.</p> <p>X adds that there is a lay-by opposite XXX XXXX that was originally planned to have a 1 hour maximum stay but cars seem to be there all day and night. X suggests that this space could be better used as the originally planned 1 hour maximum stay.</p> <p>X states they have XXXX XXXXXXXX XX XXXXX XXXX XXX XX XXXXX and this is the worst parking situation they have seen. It affects XXXXX</p>	<p>The parking restrictions have been developed based on the assumption that parked vehicles will 'migrate' to other areas hence the scale & length of the restrictions. A review of the proposals has been undertaken following the consultation and following this a section of restrictions to the north of Martins Lane has been removed. It is felt that continuing to allow vehicles to park in this location does not significantly affect the road safety in it's vicinity and may alleviate some the effects of the other restrictions.</p> <p>The Council is not aware of the 1 hour parking proposal referred to by the resident. Whilst it is appreciated this would be beneficial to the business, it is likely that such a proposal would be unlikely to receive wider support from other residents given the current parking issues. Daytime parking surveys have shown much lower levels of parking therefore it is considered that potential customers should be able to find an on-street parking space near to XXX XXXX.</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>

	<p>XXXXX greatly and they have XXXX XXXXXXXX XX XXXXXXXX struggle to park in addition to XXX XXXXXX lost everytime there are roadworks on Broad Lane.</p> <p>X believes that the proposals will only make things worse for X XXXXXXXX.</p>	<p>As a result of the number of objections, we have again looked at the proposals to see if there are any areas of Broad Lane where parking can be left unrestricted. To that end it is proposed to remove the newly proposed double yellow lines from the southern side of Broad Lane between the Martins Lane Roundabout and Ralphs Ride Roundabout This will maintain parking for 4/5 cars. As observations indicate that there is between 8-10 vehicles that regularly park on Broad Lane and so could be displaced, this length of unrestricted parking, in an area considered safe to park, will assist in preventing displacement of parking vehicles in to side roads. No further options were identified where cars could be continued to be allowed park safely or where they could potentially park safely in future. It is expected that this additional length of unrestricted parking will provide parking for some, and so the number of displaced vehicles will be low, and shared across near by roads that are already parked in by local residents, will not cause any road safety issues.</p>	
<p>X XXXXXX Broad Lane</p>	<p>X XXXXXX states that whilst X can see the need for most of the restrictions, at the Brants Bridge end the lay-by is regularly taken by users of the shops and flats. They also park all along the road and often across the end of his drive.</p> <p>X adds that if the restrictions are installed then X asks if the lay-by (across from XXXXXX XXXXXXXX) should be made for the residents across the road solely. X adds that residents of Sterling Square should not be using it for their domestic parking.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council appreciates the residents comments regarding Sterling Square residents parking in the layby; it should also be noted that layby is adopted highway therefore provided they do so in a safe and non-obstructive manner any motorist is able to park there legally.</p> <p>Given the current the levels of parking on Broad Lane and surrounding roads it is unlikely that any measures to restrict the parking in the layby would receive widespread support therefore there are no plans to implement restrictions at this location at present. Finally, it would not be possible to reserve on street parking for certain addresses within the community on the public highway.</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>
<p>X X XXXXX X XXXXXX XXXXXXX Broad Lane</p>	<p>X XXXXX asks for the restrictions to be extended to the section of road outside XXXXXX XXXXXXXX. X states they have issues with their driveway being constantly blocked due to deliveries to the nearby plumbing shop.</p> <p>X adds they have a disabled daughter and therefore rely on their vehicle.</p>	<p>Parking causing an obstruction a dropped kerb access can already be enforced by the Council's Enforcement Officers and Thames Valley Police regardless of the presence of parking restrictions. This issue has been passed to the Council's Parking Enforcement Team for their information and action.</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>
<p>X X XXXXX X XXXX XXXXXXXX Broad Lane</p>	<p>X XXXXX states that X understands the difficulties that have been presented by on-road parking and how this is affecting residents using their driveways and pedestrians using the footway.</p> <p>X XXXXX is concerned about the impact on residents of a 'no waiting at any time' restriction. This restriction would impact deliveries for residents and in particular his home run business.</p> <p>X XXXXX states X and X X run a solicitor business from their home and elderly & infirm clients who cannot walk long distances. X adds that if they cannot park outside their house, those clients will not visit and detrimentally</p>	<p>No waiting at any time restrictions does not prevent vehicles to stop to load and unload legally, therefore deliveries will be unaffected by the proposals. Vehicle passengers can be dropped off and picked up under the same loading/unloading rules.</p> <p>Disabled blue badge holders are able to park on yellow line restrictions for up to 3 hours provided they are stopped in a safe and unobstructive position.</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>

	<p>affect their business. X states they also have deliveries and collections that need somewhere to park.</p> <p>X XXXXX objects to the proposals.</p>		
<p>X X XXXXX XXXX XXXXXXXX Broad Lane</p>	<p>Whilst X XXXXX agrees in principle with the proposals X does not understand where these vehicles are going to park. X adds that X household has 3 cars and off-street parking provision for 2 so where will visitors park?</p> <p>X XXXXX states that the grassed land outside Sterling Square is not used and should be converted into parking space and the developers of Sterling Square should be forced to provide more parking.</p> <p>X asks for information regarding where additional parking will be made available.</p>	<p>The Council has received a number of complaints about parking in Broad Lane, particularly in relation to obstructed visibility when leaving driveways and obstructed footways. The Council has carried out its own checks on parking and this has shown that on average between 8-10 cars are regularly parking overnight and confirmed the issues being reported by residents.</p> <p>Whilst the Council recognises these proposals will not be popular with all residents; it has the responsibility to ensure that traffic can flow freely and safely. Unfortunately, it is not the Councils primary duty or responsibility to make provision for vehicle parking on the public highway.</p> <p>The parking restrictions have been developed based on the assumption that parked vehicles will 'migrate' to other areas hence the scale & length of the restrictions. A review of the proposals has been undertaken following the consultation and following this a section of restrictions to the north of Martins Lane has been removed. It is felt that continuing to allow vehicles to park in this location does not significantly affect the road safety in it's vicinity and may alleviate some the effects of the other restrictions.</p> <p>Providing a parking area between Sterling Square and Ogden Park has been investigated and is not feasible. This area forms the visibility splay for vehicles exiting both Sterling Square and Ogden Park and as a result needs to be kept clear of parked vehicles. Additionally, a parking facility in this position, if it were possible, would have introduced safety concerns regarding cars crossing a footway and would have resulted in the removal of the shared footway/cycleway facility that serves the development and surrounding area.</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>
<p>X X XXXXXXXX</p>	<p>X XXXXXXXX says X supports the proposed restrictions and suggest they should have installed at the same time as the restrictions installed previously.</p> <p>X adds that the issue appears to be residents of Sterling Square having nowhere else to park. X asks where will these park? X believes they will park in Poplar Close. Although there is a sign saying parking is restricted and the area is patrolled, this is not the case. None of the residents have passes and X has never seen the parking enforced. The parking in Poplar Close can be very congested.</p> <p>X XXXXXXXX adds that in Bay Road the Council has recently installed new parking bays to remove on-street parking. X suggests that the grassed area</p>	<p>The Council has received a number of complaints about parking in Broad Lane, particularly in relation to obstructed visibility when leaving driveways and obstructed footways. The Council has carried out its own checks on parking and this has shown that on average between 8-10 cars are regularly parking overnight and confirmed the issues being reported by residents.</p> <p>The parking restrictions have been developed based on the assumption that parked vehicles will 'migrate' to other areas hence the scale & length of the restrictions. Whilst it is accepted that vehicles may choose to park in Poplar Close it is felt that it's distance and 'private' status would not make it an obvious alternative parking location. Indeed two</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>

	<p>in front of Sterling Square could be converted into a parking area. X adds that BFC must have approved plans for Sterling Square so presumably parking provision was considered.</p> <p>X concludes that this new phase of restrictions is implemented but with alternative parking provided, otherwise the problem will be shunted elsewhere.</p>	<p>private roads are located closer to Sterling Square and the Council is not aware of issues of non-residential parking in either location.</p> <p>Providing a parking area between Sterling Square and Ogden Park has been investigated and is not feasible. This area forms the visibility splay for vehicles exiting both Sterling Square and Ogden Park and as a result needs to be kept clear of parked vehicles. Additionally, a parking facility in this position, if it were possible, would have introduced safety concerns regarding cars crossing a footway and would have resulted in the removal of the shared footway/cycleway facility that serves the development and surrounding area.</p>	
<p>X X XXXXXXXX Poplar Close</p>	<p>X XXXXXXXX suggests that the restrictions introduced last year have caused the existing parking problems. X asks how more restrictions will solve this as there will be less space to park safely.</p> <p>X states that the land in front of Sterling Square is owned by the Council. X adds it was the Council who instructed that this be turned into a useless green space. X suggests this this area could be turned into residents only parking.</p> <p>X states that his property was purchased with street parking in mind and we have not provided a real solution; we have just passed the problem to other residents who require parking.</p> <p>X adds that due to a lack of safe parking X has been the victim of vandalism costing thousands. Parking even further away will increase this risk.</p>	<p>The Council has received a number of complaints about parking in Broad Lane, particularly in relation to obstructed visibility when leaving driveways and obstructed footways. The Council has carried out its own checks on parking and this has shown that on average between 8-10 cars are regularly parking overnight and confirmed the issues being reported by residents.</p> <p>Whilst the Council recognises these proposals will not be popular with all residents; it has the responsibility to ensure that traffic can flow freely and safely. Unfortunately, it is not the Councils primary duty or responsibility to make provision for vehicle parking on the public highway.</p> <p>Providing a parking area between Sterling Square and Ogden Park has been investigated and is not feasible. This area forms the visibility splay for vehicles exiting both Sterling Square and Ogden Park and as a result needs to be kept clear of parked vehicles. Additionally, a parking facility in this position, if it were possible, would have introduced safety concerns regarding cars crossing a footway and would have resulted in the removal of the shared footway/cycleway facility that serves the development and surrounding area.</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>
<p>X X X XXXX X Sycamore Rise</p>	<p>X X X XXXX state that the issue with dangerous parking has arisen since the occupation of Sterling Square as only 115 parking spaces were provided as part of the development.</p> <p>They state that the Council's own parking standards dated March 2016 should have resulted in 158 parking spaces for the development. If the additional 43 spaces had been provided then the issues with obstructive parking on Broad Lane and Sycamore Rise would not be happening.</p> <p>They add if the parking restrictions are implemented on Sycamore Rise the problem will just shift up the road. They state they already have issues in Sycamore Rise with vehicles from Sterling Square.</p> <p>They suggest a more effective solution must be by way of increasing the parking provision available to residents of Sterling Square. There is ample</p>	<p>The Council has received a number of complaints about parking in Sycamore Rise, particularly in the area between the two traffic chicanes. Subsequent site visits showed that whilst most drivers are keeping the area between the chicanes clear, a small number of cars can be found parked on both sides of the road resulting in a potential issue where it can be difficult to pass through the area where these lines of parked cars meet. The two lengths of double yellow lines are designed to keep this area clear so and prevent any displaced parking from using this area, to ensure traffic can pass unhindered. From observations it is anticipated that a maximum of 3 cars could be displaced by the proposed restrictions in Sycamore Rise.</p> <p>The parking standards applied to new developments do provide for flexibility in the level of provision required, and this would be subject to supporting evidence to justify the level of parking that would be sought</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>

	<p>space at the front and inside the development which could be converted to additional parking.</p> <p>They conclude by stating the residents of Sycamore Rise should not have to bear the consequences of bizarre planning decisions with regards to the parking provision for Sterling Square. They oppose the proposed parking restrictions.</p>	<p>by the applicant. In that respect, independent surveys were taken of the flatted developments in the vicinity of this site including the flatted elements of Sycamore Rise and Ogden Park to determine the likely parking demand from this scheme and the results from that supported the level of parking for the scale and tenure of the site at Sterling Square. The developer has fulfilled their requirements with regard to the planning permission and the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site</p> <p>The Council has held discussions with Bellway Homes with regards to providing additional parking within the development, in particular allowing parking on the access road. Unfortunately no agreement could be reached leading the Council to consider further parking restrictions on Broad Lane to ensure the current safety and obstruction issues are removed.</p> <p>Providing a parking area between Sterling Square and Ogden Park has been investigated and is not feasible. This area forms the visibility splay for vehicles exiting both Sterling Square and Ogden Park and as a result needs to be kept clear of parked vehicles. Additionally, a parking facility in this position, if it were possible, would have introduced safety concerns regarding cars crossing a footway and would have resulted in the removal of the shared footway/cycleway facility that serves the development and surrounding area.</p>	
<p>X X XXXXXXXX Sycamore Rise</p>	<p>X XXXXXXXX is a resident of Sycamore Rise and X is grateful that the Council is considering measures to control on-street parking on the road. X states that that many vehicles parked on the road are non-residents. However many of the residents of Sycamore Rise do need to park their vehicles on-street daily due to the allocated parking being insufficient.</p> <p>X XXXXXXXX suggests that a permit system is considered where residents of Sycamore Rise are able to apply for a permit to park their vehicles on street. This would reduce the volume of vehicles parked on Sycamore Rise and remove non-resident vehicles from the road. X adds that this would stop residents from having to park on the grass areas.</p>	<p>Residents parking/permit schemes are designed to protect communities from competition for kerb side parking, generated by a large nearby source such as a railway station or retail development. The exiting residents parking scheme allows residents to have up to 5 permits per property together with visitor permits as the scheme is not intended to limit the number of vehicles residents may have, but to protect fro outside parking demands. These permits are charged for. Additionally, residents parking schemes (such as the one in operation around Bracknell town centre) makes allowances for adjoining/nearby roads and developments by creating residents parking zones, and so it is likely that Sterling Square would be included in such a zone if such a scheme was ever considered for the Broad Lane/Martins Lane/Sycamore Rise area. Therefore the introduction of residents parking scheme is unlikely to reduce the demand for parking spaces but would add a cost for parking to the existing residents. Residents parking is therefore not considered a suitable solution</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>
<p>X X XXXXXXXX X Sycamore Rise</p>	<p>X XXXXXXXX states that the problems with dangerous and selfish parking in Sycamore Rise started during the building of Sterling Square with builders parking and blocking the entrance into the car park and blocking access for emergency vehicles. This problem then intensified when the flats were completed and it's clear they don't have enough parking.</p>	<p>The Council has received a number of complaints about parking in Sycamore Rise, particularly in the area between the two traffic chicanes. Subsequent site visits showed that whilst most drivers are keeping the area between the chicanes clear, a small number of cars can be found parked on both sides of the road resulting in a potential issue where it can be difficult to pass through the area where these lines of parked cars meet. The two lengths of double yellow lines are</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>

X XXXXXX appreciates that the possibility of providing more parking has been explored with the Sterling Square developers. However X asks why planning permission was given with so few parking spaces. X asks where did the Council expect people to park. X adds that the plans for Sycamore Rise were given planning permission on the basis of keeping the road clear and parking provided at the back of the houses. X adds that this has been completely ruined by people who don't live here now blocking accesses and access for emergency vehicles.

X XXXXXX welcomes the proposals but has some concerns:

1. How will the restrictions be policed?
2. Where do you expect the non-residents who park in Sycamore Rise now to park. Are you just moving the problem further up the road?
3. Where do visitors for residents of Sycamore Rise park under the new restrictions?
4. Could you look at parking permits for residents of Sycamore Rise so work vans and visitors have somewhere to park

X XXXXXX welcomes the fact that the residents are finally being listened to and the dangerous parking in Sycamore Rise is being addressed but X would like assurances that it is going to improve the situation and not make it worse for residents.

designed to keep this area clear and prevent any displaced parking from using this area, to ensure traffic can pass unhindered. From observations it is anticipated that a maximum of 3 cars could be displaced by the proposed restrictions in Sycamore Rise.

The Council has several Parking Enforcement Officers who have regular patrol routes that cover the majority of the Borough. Any new restrictions are usually given a high priority in enforcement in the first few weeks of their implementation. Residents are also able to contact the Council's Parking Enforcement Team to report parking issues which then can receive specific enforcement if resources allow.

As a result of the number of objections, we have again looked at the proposals to see if there are any areas of Broad Lane where parking can be left unrestricted. To that end it is proposed to remove the newly proposed double yellow lines from the southern side of Broad Lane between the Martins Lane Roundabout and Ralphs Ride Roundabout. This will maintain parking for 4/5 cars. As observations indicate that there is between 8-10 vehicles that regularly park on Broad Lane and so could be displaced, this length of unrestricted parking, in an area considered safe to park, will assist in preventing displacement of parking vehicles in to side roads. No further options were identified where cars could be continued to be allowed park safely or where they could potentially park safely in future. It is expected that this additional length of unrestricted parking will provide parking for some, and so the number of displaced vehicles will be low, and shared across near by roads that are already parked in by local residents, will not cause any road safety issues.

With changes described above, it is anticipated that a maximum of 4/5 vehicles will be displaced from Broad Lane. This number of vehicles, shared between Martins Lane, Sycamore Rise and any other locations should have a minimal effect on the surrounding streets

Residents parking/permit schemes are designed to protect communities from competition for kerb side parking, generated by a large nearby source such as a railway station or retail development. The existing residents parking scheme allows residents to have up to 5 permits per property together with visitor permits as the scheme is not intended to limit the number of vehicles residents may have, but to protect from outside parking demands. These permits are charged for. Additionally, residents parking schemes (such as the one in operation around Bracknell town centre) makes allowances for adjoining/nearby roads and developments by creating residents parking zones, and so it is likely that Sterling Square would be included in such a zone if such a scheme was ever considered for the Broad Lane/Martins Lane/Sycamore Rise area. Therefore the introduction of residents parking scheme is unlikely to reduce the demand for parking spaces but would add a cost for parking to the existing residents. Residents parking is therefore not considered a suitable solution

<p>X X XXXXXX X Sycamore Rise</p>	<p>X XXXXXX states that the occurrences of dangerous parking along Sycamore Rise and Broad Lane have increased significantly and X is surprised there has not been any significant accidents. X adds the issue has arisen since the occupation of Sterling Square as insufficient parking spaces were provided as part of the development.</p> <p>X states that if the parking restrictions are implemented on Sycamore Rise the problem will just shift up the road. X states residents already have issues in Sycamore Rise with vehicles from Sterling Square.</p> <p>X adds that the Council's own parking standards dated March 2016 should have resulted in circa 160 parking spaces for the development. X believes that the actual number was circa 50 less than that. If the correct number of spaces had been provided then the issues with obstructive parking on Broad Lane and Sycamore Rise would not be happening.</p> <p>X asks if it is not possible to increase the parking provision available to residents of Sterling Square. There is ample space at the front and inside the development which could be converted to additional parking.</p> <p>X concludes by stating the residents of Sycamore Rise should not have to be subjected to on-going dangerous parking and the threat of serious accidents due to the 'abandoning of vehicles' by people who should be able to park in their own development. X strongly opposes the proposed parking restrictions.</p>	<p>The Council has received a number of complaints about parking in Sycamore Rise, particularly in the area between the two traffic chicanes. Subsequent site visits showed that whilst most drivers are keeping the area between the chicanes clear, a small number of cars can be found parked on both sides of the road resulting in a potential issue where it can be difficult to pass through the area where these lines of parked cars meet. The two lengths of double yellow lines are designed to keep this area clear and prevent any displaced parking from using this area, to ensure traffic can pass unhindered. From observations it is anticipated that a maximum of 3 cars could be displaced by the proposed restrictions in Sycamore Rise.</p> <p>The parking standards applied to new developments do provide for flexibility in the level of provision required, and this would be subject to supporting evidence to justify the level of parking that would be sought by the applicant. In that respect, independent surveys were taken of the flatted developments in the vicinity of this site including the flatted elements of Sycamore Rise and Ogden Park to determine the likely parking demand from this scheme and the results from that supported the level of parking for the scale and tenure of the site at Sterling Square. The developer has fulfilled their requirements with regard to the planning permission and the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site.</p> <p>The Council has held discussions with Bellway Homes with regards to providing additional parking within the development, in particular allowing parking on the access road. Unfortunately no agreement could be reached leading the Council to consider further parking restrictions on Broad Lane to ensure the current safety and obstruction issues are removed.</p> <p>Providing a parking area between Sterling Square and Ogden Park has been investigated and is not feasible. This area forms the visibility splay for vehicles exiting both Sterling Square and Ogden Park and as a result needs to be kept clear of parked vehicles. Additionally, a parking facility in this position, if it were possible, would have introduced safety concerns regarding cars crossing a footway and would have resulted in the removal of the shared footway/cycleway facility that serves the development and surrounding area.</p> <p>With changes described above, it is anticipated that a maximum of 4/5 vehicles will be displaced from Broad Lane. This number of vehicles, shared between Martins Lane, Sycamore Rise and any other locations should have a minimal effect on the surrounding streets.</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>
---------------------------------------	---	---	--

<p>X X XXXXXXXXXX X Sycamore Rise</p>	<p>X XXXXXXXXXX states that the issue with dangerous parking has arisen since the occupation of Sterling Square as only 115 parking spaces were provided as part of the development.</p> <p>X states that the Council's own parking standards dated March 2016 should have resulted in 158 parking spaces for the development. If the additional 43 spaces had been provided then the issues with obstructive parking on Broad Lane and Sycamore Rise would not be happening.</p> <p>X adds if the parking restrictions are implemented on Sycamore Rise the problem will just shift up the road. X states residents already have issues in Sycamore Rise with vehicles from Sterling Square.</p> <p>X suggests a more effective solution must be by way of increasing the parking provision available to residents of Sterling Square. There is ample space at the front and inside the development which could be converted to additional parking.</p> <p>X concludes by stating the residents of Sycamore Rise should not have to bear the consequences of planning decisions with regards to the parking provision for Sterling Square. X opposes the proposed parking restrictions.</p>	<p>The Council has received a number of complaints about parking in Sycamore Rise, particularly in the area between the two traffic chicanes. Subsequent site visits showed that whilst most drivers are keeping the area between the chicanes clear, a small number of cars can be found parked on both sides of the road resulting in a potential issue where it can be difficult to pass through the area where these lines of parked cars meet. The two lengths of double yellow lines are designed to keep this area clear and prevent any displaced parking from using this area, to ensure traffic can pass unhindered. From observations it is anticipated that a maximum of 3 cars could be displaced by the proposed restrictions in Sycamore Rise.</p> <p>The parking standards applied to new developments do provide for flexibility in the level of provision required, and this would be subject to supporting evidence to justify the level of parking that would be sought by the applicant. In that respect, independent surveys were taken of the flatted developments in the vicinity of this site including the flatted elements of Sycamore Rise and Ogden Park to determine the likely parking demand from this scheme and the results from that supported the level of parking for the scale and tenure of the site at Sterling Square. The developer has fulfilled their requirements with regard to the planning permission and the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site</p> <p>The Council has held discussions with Bellway Homes with regards to providing additional parking within the development, in particular allowing parking on the access road. Unfortunately no agreement could be reached leading the Council to consider further parking restrictions on Broad Lane to ensure the current safety and obstruction issues are removed.</p> <p>Providing a parking area between Sterling Square and Ogden Park has been investigated and is not feasible. This area forms the visibility splay for vehicles exiting both Sterling Square and Ogden Park and as a result needs to be kept clear of parked vehicles. Additionally, a parking facility in this position, if it were possible, would have introduced safety concerns regarding cars crossing a footway and would have resulted in the removal of the shared footway/cycleway facility that serves the development and surrounding area.</p> <p>With changes described above, it is anticipated that a maximum of 4/5 vehicles will be displaced from Broad Lane. This number of vehicles, shared between Martins Lane, Sycamore Rise and any other locations should have a minimal effect on the surrounding streets</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>
<p>X X X XXXXX Sycamore Rise</p>	<p>X X X XXXXX are in agreement that the parking situation in their street is not ideal. The on-street parking is vastly occupied by vehicles whose owners do not reside in the street. They state that the parking has got increasingly worse since Sterling Square has been built. They add they are disappointed that discussions with the developers to provide more parking</p>	<p>The Council has received a number of complaints about parking in Sycamore Rise, particularly in the area between the two traffic chicanes. Subsequent site visits showed that whilst most drivers are keeping the area between the chicanes clear, a small number of cars can be found parked on both sides of the road resulting in a potential</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further</p>

	<p>have not gone well and add it demonstrates their lack of consideration for local residents.</p> <p>They add that in addition to the identified parking issues in Sycamore Rise but the accesses to off-street parking areas which will only be made worse by the proposals. They suggest that parking restrictions on one side of Sycamore Rise should be introduced so to allow good forward visibility for cars travelling along there. They state that whilst the restrictions at the junction of Broad Lane and Sycamore Rise have improved the situation at that location they have pushed parking further into Sycamore Rise.</p> <p>They also suggest consideration could be given to introducing residents only parking on Sycamore Rise and restricting parking at the entrance to the off-street parking areas.</p>	<p>issue where it can be difficult to pass through the area where these lines of parked cars meet. The two lengths of double yellow lines are designed to keep this area clear and prevent any displaced parking from using this area, to ensure traffic can pass unhindered. From observations it is anticipated that a maximum of 3 cars could be displaced by the proposed restrictions in Sycamore Rise.</p> <p>Residents parking/permit schemes are designed to protect communities from competition for kerb side parking, generated by a large nearby source such as a railway station or retail development. The exiting residents parking scheme allows residents to have up to 5 permits per property together with visitor permits as the scheme is not intended to limit the number of vehicles residents may have, but to protect fro outside parking demands. These permits are charged for. Additionally, residents parking schemes (such as the one in operation around Bracknell town centre) makes allowances for adjoining/nearby roads and developments by creating residents parking zones, and so it is likely that Sterling Square would be included in such a zone if such a scheme was ever considered for the Broad Lane/Martins Lane/Sycamore Rise area. Therefore the introduction of residents parking scheme is unlikely to reduce the demand for parking spaces but would add a cost for parking to the existing residents. Residents parking is therefore not considered a suitable solution</p> <p>Whilst the suggestion of restricting parking on one side of Sycamore Rise it is considered that given the current parking situation this would be not be popular with the majority of residents and may create new problems further into the road.</p> <p>Parking in other areas of Sycamore Rise was not identified to be an issue that warranted parking restrictions at the time of the site visits. However, once the restrictions are put in place the surrounding roads will be monitored and if additional restrictions are needed, they will be put forward in the next Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).</p>	<p>mitigation measures</p>
<p>X X XXXXXX Sycamore Rise</p>	<p>X XXXXXX suggests that the restrictions should be placed at the entrance to Sycamore Rise as when cars double park as it makes driving in this area dangerous. X adds that only having one parking space available to X will make visitor parking very difficult.</p> <p>X suggests that permit parking would be a better option.</p>	<p>The Council has received a number of complaints about parking in Sycamore Rise, particularly in the area between the two traffic chicanes. Subsequent site visits showed that whilst most drivers are keeping the area between the chicanes clear, a small number of cars can be found parked on both sides of the road resulting in a potential issue where it can be difficult to pass through the area where these lines of parked cars meet. The two lengths of double yellow lines are designed to keep this area clear and prevent any displaced parking from using this area, to ensure traffic can pass unhindered. From observations it is anticipated that a maximum of 3 cars could be displaced by the proposed restrictions in Sycamore Rise.</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>
<p>X X X X X XXXX X Sycamore Rise</p>	<p>X X X XXXX state there has been a noticeable increase in the number of vehicles parked in Broad Lane, Sycamore Rise & Martins Lane since the</p>	<p>The parking standards applied to new developments do provide for flexibility in the level of provision required, and this would be subject to</p>	<p>Place proposals on</p>

	<p>completion of Sterling Square & its inadequate allocation of parking spaces. Whilst they understand the need for some of the new measures, they are concerned the proposals will not address the issues. They add that these extra vehicles will not disappear and will have to park somewhere.</p> <p>They state that several cars already park in the first section of Sycamore rise, Martins Lane & Northampton Close. Sterling Square, Brattain Court and Quadrant Court all have private parking and Ogden Park is already full with cars. They also state that there are two houses in Broad Lane who have no parking outside their homes.</p> <p>They suggest that other alternatives, starting with the provision of more parking spaces at Sterling Square such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) building a parking lay-by on the section of verge in front of Sterling Square; ii) allow partial pavement parking in Sycamore Rise which would 'widen' the road. Also remove the two chicane points which serve no purpose and would allow more parking. The entrances to the parking areas would need to be protected from parking. 	<p>supporting evidence to justify the level of parking that would be sought by the applicant. In that respect, independent surveys were taken of the flatted developments in the vicinity of this site including the flatted elements of Sycamore Rise and Ogden Park to determine the likely parking demand from this scheme and the results from that supported the level of parking for the scale and tenure of the site at Sterling Square. The developer has fulfilled their requirements with regard to the planning permission and the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site</p> <p>The Council has held discussions with Bellway Homes with regards to providing additional parking within the development, in particular allowing parking on the access road. Unfortunately no agreement could be reached leading the Council to consider further parking restrictions on Broad Lane to ensure the current safety and obstruction issues are removed.</p> <p>Providing a parking area between Sterling Square and Ogden Park has been investigated and is not feasible. This area forms the visibility splay for vehicles exiting both Sterling Square and Ogden Park and as a result needs to be kept clear of parked vehicles. Additionally, a parking facility in this position, if it were possible, would have introduced safety concerns regarding cars crossing a footway and would have resulted in the removal of the shared footway/cycleway facility that serves the development and surrounding area.</p> <p>With changes described above, it is anticipated that a maximum of 4/5 vehicles will be displaced from Broad Lane. This number of vehicles, shared between Martins Lane, Sycamore Rise and any other locations should have a minimal effect on the surrounding streets</p>	<p>hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>
<p>X X XXXX</p>	<p>X XXXX would like to offer X comments and observations on the proposals.</p> <p>X states that cars and vans are parking on both sides of the road from the end of the existing double yellow lines. Some are parked correctly whereas some are double parked or parked with one wheel on the footway. X adds that X finds it difficult to get out of our parking area as we can't see cars coming up Sycamore Rise. X doubts that on some occasions that a fire engine would not be able to get between the cars.</p> <p>X suggests that the double yellow lines should be extended up to the entrance to the Debden house parking area on both sides, or at least on his side so they can see oncoming traffic.</p>	<p>The Council has received a number of complaints about parking in Sycamore Rise, particularly in the area between the two traffic chicanes. Subsequent site visits showed that whilst most drivers are keeping the area between the chicanes clear, a small number of cars can be found parked on both sides of the road resulting in a potential issue where it can be difficult to pass through the area where these lines of parked cars meet. The two lengths of double yellow lines are designed to keep this area clear and prevent any displaced parking from using this area, to ensure traffic can pass unhindered. From observations it is anticipated that a maximum of 3 cars could be displaced by the proposed restrictions in Sycamore Rise.</p> <p>Parking in other areas of Sycamore Rise was not identified to be an issue that warranted parking restrictions at the time of the site visits. However, once the restrictions are put in place the surrounding roads will be monitored and if additional restrictions are needed, they will be put forward in the next Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>

<p>X X XXXXX Sycamore Rise</p>	<p>X X XXXXX is strongly for the proposed restrictions on Sycamore Rise. As a resident of XXXXXX XXXXX for X XXXXX X has seen the increase in the number of vehicles parked on Sycamore Rise in the last two years with the extra vehicles coming from Sterling Square.</p> <p>X states X has seen people park the vehicles and then down and out of Sycamore Rise. They park on both sides leading to tight gaps to pass through. X adds this has led to other residents persistently sounding their horns as they drive past, as they mistakenly believe the vehicles belong to residents of XXXXXX XXXXX.</p> <p>X adds X finds it frustrating that people buy properties but do not consider where they will park when they only have one parking space. X states it would be near impossible for any emergency vehicle to pass through Sycamore Rise with the way parking is at the moment.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>
<p>X X X XXXXXX X Sycamore Rise</p>	<p>X X X XXXXXX write as disgruntled residents who have witnessed dangerous/inconsiderate parking because of the lack of parking spaces in Sterling Square. Over the last couple of years they have observed a huge increase in problem parking in what was previously a peaceful street. They have experienced people parking over their driveway and parking on the footway. When they have tried to talk to people about their parking they have been verbally abused and live in fear they may come home to find their car or home damaged.</p> <p>They state it is clear that the Council have granted many permissions for the building of apartments and multiple properties where single properties once stood. These new properties have a minimum of one parking space per household with each development having inadequate for visitors and most households have 2 cars anyway.</p> <p>They add that it is the Council's aim to drive people to use public transport and dispense with more than one car. That is not practical as the public transport in Bracknell Forest is not adequate, there is no night bus and residents can no longer even get a bus direct to the airport.</p> <p>They feel that the current situation is a direct result of the poor planning of Bracknell Forest Council and the inability of officers to follow the guidelines of the town & Country Planning Act. Through the poor planning the Council has placed the residents of Sycamore Rise in an invidious situation of managing parking that they should not have to manage.</p>	<p>The parking standards applied to new developments do provide for flexibility in the level of provision required, and this would be subject to supporting evidence to justify the level of parking that would be sought by the applicant. In that respect, independent surveys were taken of the flatted developments in the vicinity of this site including the flatted elements of Sycamore Rise and Ogden Park to determine the likely parking demand from this scheme and the results from that supported the level of parking for the scale and tenure of the site at Sterling Square. The developer has fulfilled their requirements with regard to the planning permission and the Council has no legal authority with which to request additional parking on the site</p>	<p>Place proposals on hold pending investigation into further mitigation measures</p>

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

A site meeting was held with Cllr R Angell where he raised his concerns about the comments and objections that had been raised. After discussing the proposals it was agreed to recommend that they are removed from the current Order process and further measures to mitigate the effects of

displacing vehicles from Broad Lane are investigated. Modified proposals will be included in the next Order process and be re-consulted upon. It is currently planned that work on the next Order will begin in the New Year.

Cllr I Kirke has indicated his support for this approach.